THE PROCEEDINGS

OF

THE SOUTH CAROLINA

HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1931

CONTENTS

S. C. STATE LIBRARY BOARD

THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS, 1930–1931

PERCY S. FLIPPIN - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *President*
ANNIE G. WILLIAMS - - - - - - - - *Secretary and Treasurer*

OFFICERS, 1931–1932

ROBERT L. MERIWETHER - - - - - - - - - - - - *President*
ROSSER H. TAYLOR - - - - - - - - - - - - *Vice-President*
ARNEY R. CHILDS - - - - - - - - *Secretary and Treasurer*

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ROBERT L. MERIWETHER - - - - - - - - ARNEY R. CHILDS
ROSSER H. TAYLOR - - - - - - - - - J. HAROLD EASTERBY
MARSHALL W. BROWN

J. HAROLD EASTERBY
Editor

The South Carolina Historical Association supplies the *Proceedings* to all its members; the Executive Committee elects the editor. The price, to persons who are not members, is 50 cents per copy. Orders should be sent to Arney R. Childs, Logan School, Columbia, S. C.

Copyright, 1931
by
The South Carolina Historical Association

PRESS OF
THE R. L. BRYAN COMPANY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

THE PROCEEDINGS
of
THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
1931

The First Annual Meeting

The meeting of The South Carolina Historical Association in Columbia on Saturday, March 14, 1931, was both a fulfillment of hopes long brewing in the past and a promise for the future. The hopes had their origin years ago with Professor R. L. Meriwether, had been imparted to others and cherished by them, and in the spring of 1930 were put into definite form by a representative group of history teachers who had come to Coker College, Hartsville, at the invitation of President Carlyle Campbell and Professor P. S. Flippin, to hear the lectures by Professor W. E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago. At that time a preliminary organization was formed. Professor Flippin was elected president, and Professor Annie G. Williams, Lander College, secretary and treasurer. These officers, together with committees which they appointed, laid plans for a first annual meeting, and the results were most gratifying. The promise for the future lies in the fact that this body adopted a permanent organization which has for its objects: "The promotion of historical studies in the State of South Carolina, a closer relationship among persons living in this State who are interested in history, and the preservation of historical records."

Seventy persons attended one or more of the three sessions into which the meeting was divided. They were, for the most part, members of the faculties of the universities, colleges, high schools and preparatory schools of the State, but there were present in addition to these several persons who are not engaged in teaching. The morning and afternoon sessions were held in Clariosophic Hall on the campus of the University of South Carolina. The evening, or dinner, session was held at the Jefferson Hotel.

The morning session was opened at eleven by Professor Flippin, who delivered the president's address in which the purposes of the Association were outlined. The following papers were then read: "The British South Africa Company" by Professor M. W. Brown, Presbyterian College; "The Granger Movement in South Carolina" by Professor J. H. Easterby, College of Charleston; and "Electoral

Corruption in England, 1702–1714" by Professor C. M. Ferrell, University of South Carolina. Each was followed by an interested discussion led respectively by Professor Emma C. Denmark, Greenville Woman's College; Professor C. E. Cauthen, Columbia College; and Professor C. L. Epting, Wofford College.

The first part of the afternoon session was occupied by Professor A. W. Calhoun, Limestone College, who delivered an interesting talk on "The Reorganization of the History Department on the Basis of the Economic Interpretation". The meeting then proceeded to the discussion and adoption of a constitution which gave permanent organization to the Association. An election to fill the offices provided for by the constitution resulted in the choice of Professor R. L. Meriwether, University of South Carolina, president; Professor R. H. Taylor, Furman University, vice-president; Mrs. Arney R. Childs, principal of Logan School (Columbia, S. C.), secretary and treasurer; and Professors J. H. Easterby (for three years), and M. W. Brown (for two years), members of the executive committee. On the motion of Professor F. D. Jones, Presbyterian College, the executive committee was instructed to appoint a committee on the preservation of historical records. On the motion of Professor W. H. Mills, Clemson College, the executive committee was authorized to consider the feasibility of making a contribution to the South Carolina War Memorial Building Fund. A resolution, offered by Professor Denmark, was passed thanking the University of South Carolina and the Clariosophic Literary Society for the hospitality extended to the Association and also all persons who had contributed to the success of the meeting.

After dinner at the evening session Professor W. G. Keith, Winthrop College, read an interesting paper on "William Rufus King of North Carolina and Alabama". The lively discussion which followed was led by Dr. Anne K. Gregorie. After several impromptu and enthusiastic remarks on the prospects of the Association, the meeting was adjourned.

J. H. E.

THE BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY

M. W. BROWN
Presbyterian College

About Rhodesia there is a haze of romance. Its story is one of European rivalry against a dark background of primitive African savagery. Probably no other section came so rapidly from the mists of the Dark Continent into the full light of modern civilization. Perhaps no other part of the British Empire has a history which could so well fortify Carlyle's theory that history is the biography of great men. Every account of the region mentions Cecil Rhodes again and again. As early as 1891 the country was called Rhodesia by the leading colonial papers, and this name was officially adopted by the South Africa Company in a proclamation of May, 1895.[1] An Order in Council of 1898 gave the name imperial recognition.[2] A German has called Cecil Rhodes a "südafrikanischer Napoleon",[3] but, in the daring flight of his imagination, he was rather a Cortez who, with a few men of firm resolution, won in Rhodesia a noble heritage.

In the early part of the nineteenth century much of Africa was so little known that the saying of Swift yet held true:

> "Geographers in Afric maps
> With savage pictures fill the gaps
> And over inhabitable downs
> Place elephants for want of towns." [4]

Although African exploration was greatly advanced in the thirty-year period, 1850–1880, European competition for African territory did not begin for several years after Rhodes landed in Durban in 1870. France hoped to find in colonial expansion compensation for national defeat but took little interest in South Africa. It was at this time that Bismarck remarked, "Diese Kolonialgeschichte ist für uns genau so, wie der seidne Pelz in polnischen Adelsfamilien, die keine Hemden haben".[5]

Rhodes had gone to South Africa in poor health, but, strengthened by that climate, he was enabled to resume his education in England.[6] While an undergraduate at Oxford he was profoundly impressed by a saying of Aristotle as to the importance of having an aim in life sufficiently lofty to justify spending one's life in an endeavor to reach

[1] H. M. Hole, *The Making of Rhodesia*, p. 338.
[2] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1899, LXIII., Cd. 9138, p. 2.
[3] Dietrich Schäfer, *Kolonialgeschichte* (2 vols., Berlin and Leipzig, 1921), II. 122.
[4] Paul Darmstaedter, *Geschichte der Aufteilung und Kolonisation Africas seit dem Zeitalter der Entdeckungen* (2 vols., Berlin and Leipzig, 1913, 1920), II. 2.
[5] *Ibid.*, II. 54.
[6] Basil Williams, *Cecil Rhodes*, p. 11.

it. Resolving to follow the philosopher's advice, he decided to make his aim in life the extension of British territory and the promotion of the unity of the English-speaking race.[7]

In the 'eighties, a number of European countries were feeling the imperial impulse, and Rhodes was worried because many South Africans were indifferent about the possible expansion of England's rivals in Africa. He made vehement speeches telling of the great trade possibilities of the northern region and characterizing the Bechuanaland territory as "the Suez Canal of the trade of this country, the key of its road to the interior".[8] Although Rhodes rejoiced when Bechuanaland was made a protectorate in 1885, the phrase just quoted shows that he regarded the newly-acquired territory as a stepping-stone to the central lakes and the African empire of which he dreamed.

The territory north of the new protectorate was controlled by the Matabele, the most formidable fighting race in South Africa. Mr. J. S. Moffat (the brother-in-law of David Livingstone), who knew the Matabele intimately, reported in 1884 that the Matabele king, Lobengula, treated Englishmen well, but stated: "I cannot say much for the Matabele in their relations with their native neighbors. They are cattle lifters and men stealers, and have swept the country all around them."[9] Lobengula's men had no industries but lived on plunder. So great was the terror of the Matabele name that the other natives in the district, the Mashonas, never attempted to defend their property but, abandoning their cattle and provisions, sought refuge by hiding in caves.[10] An official report made to the Imperial Government in 1886 said that the Matabele could hardly be called a tribe, being rather "a military organization occupying a rich territory which they have depopulated".[11]

The English came to know that the territory controlled by this formidable tribe was exceedingly desirable. In the *Parliamentary Papers* of 1884–5 Mashonaland is reported as a beautiful, fertile, healthful land, rich in gold, copper, iron, and with some saltpetre.[12] On September 5, 1885, Lt. C. E. Haynes reported, "Matabeleland proper is probably the most healthy [*sic*] part in South Africa and its agricultural capabilities are surpassed by none".[13] Through the influence of Mr. J. S. Moffat, Lobengula signed on February 11, 1888, a treaty of peace and amity with the British and agreed that the Matabele would refrain from entering into any correspondence with

[7] *The American Monthly Review of Reviews* (1899), XX. 554-559.
[8] Williams, *Rhodes*, p. 73.
[9] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884-5, LVII., Cd. 4588, pp. 104-105.
[10] *Ibid.*, 1884-5, LVII., Cd. 5588, p. 98.
[11] *Ibid.*, 1886, XLVIII., Cd. 4643, p. 113.
[12] *Ibid.*, 1884-5, LVII., Cd. 4588, p. 97.
[13] *Ibid.*, 1886, XLVIII., Cd. 4643, p. 122.

a foreign state or permit any sale or cession of land without the previous knowledge and sanction of Her Majesty's High Commissioner for South Africa. Moffat said that Lobengula signed the document after protracted discussion and explanation and that he was thoroughly satisfied that the King knew what he had done.[14]

Cecil Rhodes knew that the Moffat treaty would stimulate efforts by various companies for concessions, and he sent to interview Lobengula a group of three trusted men: C. D. Rudd, Rochford Maquire, and Frank Thompson.[15] The trio made a wagon journey of more than a thousand miles in order to reach Bulawayo, where they skillfully conducted negotiations during which their lives were for a time endangered.[16] Through their influence Lobengula placed his mark on a document, October 30, 1888, wherein it was agreed that he should receive a supply of arms and ammunition and that he and his successors were to be given one hundred pounds sterling each month. In return Lobengula granted complete and exclusive charge of the metals and minerals of the kingdom with full power to do all things deemed necessary to procure the same.[17]

Rhodes planned to develop this valuable concession by means of a chartered company—a form of organization which had played an important part in the history of the British Empire. The chartered companies of the nineteenth century had two purposes: to take possession of a new territory and to develop it commercially. Although the companies were rarely profitable commercially, the spirit of adventure, instinct of domination, and the allurement of having a part in empire-building caused men always to be ready to pour out capital for these enterprises.[18] After amalgamating their interests with some other groups interested in the same territory, Rhodes and his associates applied on April 30, 1889, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies asking for the support and sanction of Her Majesty's Government in the formation of a company.[19] Despite some Parliamentary opposition the royal charter of incorporation of the British South Africa Company was signed by Queen Victoria on October 29, 1889.[20]

The company was given wide powers, including the rights to make treaties, pass laws, maintain a police force, acquire new concessions, make land grants, and engage in any industry it desired. In granting

[14] *Ibid.*, 1888, LXXV., Cd. 5524, pp. 12-13.
[15] W. A. Wills and L. T. Collingridge, *The Downfall of Lobengula* (London, 1894), pp. 48, 53.
[16] Hole, *Making of Rhodesia*, pp. 73-74.
[17] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1890, LI., Cd. 5918, pp. 139-140.
[18] Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, *De la Colonisation chez les peuples Modernes* (5th ed., 2 vols., Paris, 1902), II. 662, 667.
[19] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1890, LI., Cd. 5918, p. 189.
[20] Hansard, *Debates*, 1889, CCCXL. 376, 486.

the charter the government reserved the right to alter or repeal any of the charter provisions at the end of twenty-five years and at the end of each succeeding period of ten years. Changes might be made also at any time if the company's privileges were misused. The company was always to remain British in character and domicile, and its directors were always to be British subjects or persons approved by Great Britain's Secretary of State.[21]

The new company aroused considerable enthusiasm in England. As soon as it seemed certain that the charter was to be granted, the *Times* declared, "Great Britain has at last stretched out both her hands to the border of the Zambesi, the great river whose chequered course was first made known to Europe by our countryman, Livingstone".[22] A large distribution of shares was made possible because the original capital of the company was fixed at one million pounds, divided into a million shares of one pound each. So popular was the new venture with the public that by March 18, 1890, the right to apply for a one-pound share of the company was selling for four pounds.[23]

The boundaries of the British South Africa Company's territory were, in the language of the *Times,* "left happily vague".[24] Article two of the charter stated that "the principal field of the operations of the British South Africa Company . . . shall be the region of South Africa lying immediately to the north of British Bechuanaland, and to the north and west of the South African Republic, and to the west of the Portuguese Dominions".[25] One notes that no northern or western limit was set to the company's territory. The way was now open for Rhodes to carry out his plans for wide British expansion.

For a time it was believed that the occupation of the country could be accomplished only by the aid of a military expedition which would exhaust the resources of the company. A young man named Frank Johnson, however, succeeded in organizing a group of 184 adventurous pioneers who agreed to make the attempt accompanied by only a small police force. Each pioneer was promised 7s.6d. a day while on the march and a 3,000-acre farm and fifteen gold claims when the new territory was reached. The advance guard left Kimberly on March 19, 1890, and by September 12 the entire force had gone 460 miles to a site which was named Salisbury in honor of the Prime Minister.[26]

[21] *Parliamentary Papers,* 1898, LX., Cd. 8773, pp. 3–9.
[22] London *Times,* October 15, 1889.
[23] Hansard, *Debates,* 1890, CCCXLII. 1142.
[24] London *Times,* October 15, 1889.
[25] *Parliamentary Papers,* 1898, LX., Cd. 8773, p. 4.
[26] Williams, *Rhodes,* pp. 144–148; Wills and Collingridge, *Downfall of Lobengula,* pp. 26–27.

Although the colony was established without a fight, it was generally believed for a year after the establishment of Salisbury that the country could never have success until the war-loving Matabele were "crushed and welded into shape". When the company's administrator, L. S. Jameson, spoke in 1893 of "going into Matabeleland to settle the question finally", he found that even the clergy agreed with him on every point.[27] After a plundering raid of the Matabele in July, 1893, settlers in both Salisbury and Victoria held mass meetings demanding that the company fight.[28] Although the company officials had been told that they "must not look to the Imperial Government" for assistance,[29] they raised a force of 1,227 men. After successively defeating 5,000 and 7,000 Matabele, the company's forces occupied Bulawayo and, by December 22, had completely broken their military power. The death-roll of the company's forces was eighty-four. The cost in money was about £113,500.[30] By an Order in Council of July 18, 1894, the dominions of Lobengula were assigned to the company to govern along the lines of a crown colony.[31]

The two years following the war were years of commercial and industrial progress. The value of the British South Africa Company's shares rose from 42s to 170s; the settlers were prospering and had high hopes for the future.[32] When, however, Dr. Jameson withdrew many of the white police to aid in the famous raid of December 19, 1895, into the Transvaal, the discontented natives were given an unexpected opportunity. They had a number of grievances and had been told by an influential "witch-doctor" that all their troubles would end when the white people were killed. First the Matabele and then the Mashonas rose in bloody rebellion.

During part of the guerrilla warfare which ensued, Rhodes was in London to give testimony about the Jameson Raid before the British South Africa Committee of the House of Commons. As soon as he was released, however, he hurried back to Rhodesia. Because of his complicity in the Raid he had resigned as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony and had given up his connection with the British South Africa Company. Although he now had no official position of any kind, everyone looked to him for advice. His reckless bravery at this trying time and his sacrifices for his adopted country slowly won back for him some of the esteem lost by the Raid. After troops recruited by the company had defeated the natives, it was largely

[27] *Parliamentary Papers,* 1893-94, LXI., Cd. 7171, p. 60.
[28] W. H. Brown, *On the South African Frontier,* pp. 268-269; W. S. Blunt, *My Diaries,* I. 114-115.
[29] *Parliamentary Papers,* 1893-94, LXI., Cd. 7171, pp. 10, 48.
[30] W. B. Worsfold, *The Union of South Africa,* pp. 174-176.
[31] *Parliamentary Papers,* 1898, LX., Cd. 8773, pp. 13-20.
[32] *National Review* (1895-96), XXVI. 786-797.

through his influence that the latter agreed to lay down their arms. By October, 1897, all traces of rebellion had disappeared and the era of adventure in Rhodesia was at an end.[33]

After the Jameson Raid bitter attacks on the company were made in the House of Commons, and there was danger that the charter would be withdrawn.[34] Most of the Parliamentary members, however, agreed with the belief of Joseph Chamberlain that if "Rhodesia were made a crown colony, the development of the country would be delayed because the English Treasury would never consent to the expenditure of the money requisite for its development".[35] An arrangement was made whereby the British Government secured such control and supervision over the administration of the British South Africa Company as would prevent in the future any serious abuse of the company's powers.[36]

It was at this time that Rhodesians were first given a share in their own government. A legislative council was established which consisted of the administrator, the resident commissioner, and a board of nine members, five nominated by the company and four elected by the male citizens.[37] The company continued to grant more and more power to the settlers, and by 1914 the council consisted of thirteen elected members and only six appointed.[38]

The company's charter was to expire in 1914, but at the request of the Rhodesian Legislative Council the British Government permitted a temporary continuation. For several years there was uncertainty as to the final form of government for the territory. In October, 1922, however, the Rhodesians voted by a majority of 2,785 in favor of responsible government.[39] On September 29, 1923, an agreement was reached between the crown and the company whereby the latter was to give up the administration of southern Rhodesia on October 1, 1923, and of northern Rhodesia on April 1, 1924. The crown was to pay the company £3,750,000 for administrative deficits and to abandon its claims for £1,953,826 advanced to the company for extraordinary expenditures in the late war.[40] The fact that the market value of the company's shares remained the same at this time may be taken as an indication that this settlement was a just one.[41]

[33] *Nineteenth Century* (1902), LI. 841-848; Hole, *Making of Rhodesia*, pp. 348-380.
[34] Hansard, *Debates*, 1897, LI. 1093-1171.
[35] *Ibid.*, LI. 1174-1175.
[36] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1899, LXIII., Cd. 9138, pp. 1, 5, 15, 26.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[38] *Ibid.*, 1921, XXIV., Cd. 1273, p. 2; Hansard, *Debates*, 1921, CXLIV. 1606-1607.
[39] *Journal of the African Society* (1922-23), XXII. 68-69.
[40] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1923, XVIII., Cd. 1984, pp. 5, 7, 12.
[41] Hansard, *Debates*, 1923, CLXVII., 501-502.

The annexation of Southern Rhodesia to the British Crown was formally proclaimed in 1923, the thirty-third anniversary of the British South Africa Company. The company's capital then stood at £8,768,000, and it had expended nearly £14,500,000 in South Africa. Its lands and concessions were valued at £5,140,384, and its other investments at £4,806,000. For eighteen months its revenues had exceeded its expenditures, and it declared a two and one half per cent dividend—the first dividend during the thirty-three years of the company's operation.[42]

Since giving up administrative duties, the company has continued as a commercial enterprise. Although its shareholders went a third of a century without profits, recent annual dividends of over 8 per cent. indicate that the company is now making a commercial success. The directors are making far-reaching plans for the futher industrial development of Rhodesia.[43]

As we make a final estimate of the company's work, it is well to quote from a speech which Rhodes made to the shareholders on January 18, 1895: "We have been accused," he said, "of being a speculative set of company-mongers, but no one who started this idea could have seen any great hope of financial success from it. By your support we have carried it through. Whenever the man in the street sneers in that way, remind him that it was an undertaking which he had not the courage to take part in himself as one of the British people. The Imperial Government would not touch it. The Cape Government was too poor to do so. It has been done, however, and is a success. I do not think any one would say now that he would prefer to see that portion of the world under another flag. It has been done also—which the English people like—without expense to their exchequer."[44] Lord Selbourne had something of the same feeling when, in 1907, he declared that "whatever criticism may be made of the chartered company, it must never be forgotten that it saved the hinterland to South Africa".[45]

The company not only "saved the hinterland", but it also developed it. One especially impressive example of the company's activities is railway construction. Realizing the importance of railroads in developing Africa, Rhodes and the directors after him showed marvelous energy about railway projects.[46] While the percentage of railway mileage increase from 1901 to 1911 was only 31.6 per cent. for the whole Empire, Rhodesian railway mileage in-

[42] London *Times*, July 17, 1924, based on an official report of the company.
[43] *Ibid.*, February 11, 1927; February 10, 1928.
[44] *Vindex*, "Cecil Rhodes," pp. 417-440.
[45] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1907, LVII., Cd. 3564, p. 51.
[46] *Journal of the African Society* (1920-21), XX. 241-258.

creased 142 per cent. during the same period.[47] Besides developing business enterprises rapidly, the company has looked after the moral and physical needs of the colonists. It has subsidized public hospitals, established district surgeons at all important cities, subsidized other medical officers, made generous provision for education, and has established parks and recreation grounds.[48]

As we consider this record, we feel that General Smuts was justified when, in 1922, he declared that the record of the British South Africa Company "will compare favorably with that of any chartered company that has ever existed in the history of the British Empire".[49]

[47] *Oxford Survey of the British Empire,* VI. 367.
[48] Worsfold, *Union of South Africa,* pp. 196-198.
[49] *Round Table,* XIII. 205.

ELECTORAL CORRUPTION IN ENGLAND, 1702-1714

C. M. FERRELL
University of South Carolina

During the reign of Queen Anne, electoral corruption advanced another step towards its triumph later under Walpole and Newcastle. Already it had rooted itself firmly in the character and habits of English political life in which its influences all too amply revealed themselves.

By 1700 corrupt practices had developed to an alarming extent. Since the Restoration conditions had led to an increasing resort to all sorts of corruption at elections. The low standard of morality which Charles II and his coterie brought to England, the reaction against the "Rule of the Saints", the rise and growing strife of political parties seeking to obtain control of the crown at all costs—all tended to lower morals. Then, too, the increasing wealth of Englishmen, derived from a rapidly expanding commerce, industry and empire, produced important "monied interests" which threw their fortunes into the contest with the landed and ecclesiastical interests which hitherto had dominated English politics. By 1701 the situation had become so bad that Bishop Burnet declared, "a most scandalous practice was brought in of buying votes with so little decency that the electors engaged themselves by subscription to choose a blank person before they were trusted with the name of their candidate";[1] while Charles Davenant declined to stand for election because "the electors are generally such a pack of corrupt rogues that it is a chance an honest man should represent them".[2]

The electoral system itself encouraged corruption. Innumerable borough qualifications and the different kinds of county freeholds facilitated illegal voting. *Viva voce* voting invited intimidation; while the length of elections (some lasted forty days), gave admirable opportunities for bribery and treating.

Time permits but a brief sketch of the main aspects of electoral corruption during Anne's reign. In this paper the attempt is made, by frequent quotations, to portray the tricks in the trades of the corrupter and the corrupted.

Before discussing the corrupt practices we should note the influence exerted by the crown. It is significant that on four occassions a change of ministry preceded a general election which returned ministerial majorities thus showing the importance of the

[1] Bishop Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time* (2nd Ed., enlarged, 6 vols., Oxford, 1833), IV. 476.
[2] *Marquis of Ailesbury Manuscripts* in Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports (London, 1898), p. 88.

crown and ministers. Moreover, the queen herself was not inactive. In 1702 her marked Tory preference "wrought on the inconstancy and servility that is natural to multitudes",[3] while in 1705 the Duchess of Marlborough declared that it was the "Queen's Desire" that those who voted for the "tack" should not be elected, "for such men would unhinge the Government".[4]

Illegal voting was the most prevalent corrupt practice. In the election of 1702 some thirty seats were contested on this ground, and in later elections the number ranged as high as double that number. Nearly every petition charged this offense either singly or in conjunction with others. Intricate franchise qualifications made illegal voting easy and frequent, while differences in interpretation of the law led to the casting of many votes later thrown out. Often the voting list was increased or decreased solely for political purposes, as at Oakhampton in 1710, where the mayor and aldermen met in an alehouse several months before the election and illegally admitted 135 new freemen "generally Strangers . . . Vagrants, Deserters from the Queen's Service".[5] At Ludgarshall, in 1713, an agent noted that "Several good old voters . . . at the past poll . . . were struck off because they would have voted for Mr. Skyllyng, and many new sham votes made and allowed to pass . . . because they voted for General Webb".[6]

A favorite device for padding the poll list was the making of "faggot voters" by dividing or splitting freeholds. Many complaints were made against this practice. For example, in the 1705 election in Hertfordshire there "were 450 polled more than ever was known at any former election" indicating that many freeholders "were made . . . by collusion on purpose to vote for this election".[7] At Ludgarshall twenty-six new voters were made in this way.[8] At Leicester fifty-four "faggot voters" were created in 1705; while of the electors it was charged that six voted twice, twenty-eight were either not on the poll book or had their parish dues paid by their landlords, and eleven were not on the book or known by any in the borough.[9]

Manipulation of the election by candidates or partial polling officials was another abuse. This was accomplished by advancing or delaying the time of the election or by holding the election under non-official auspices. At Chichester, in 1710, the mayor illegally

[3] Burnet, *op. cit.*, V. 45.
[4] *Journal of the House of Commons*, XV. 38.
[5] *Ibid.*, XVI. 419.
[6] *Ailesbury MSS.*, p. 211.
[7] *Coke Manuscripts* in *Manuscripts of Earl of Cowper* in Royal Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports (London, 1888–1889), III. 61.
[8] *Commons Journal*, XV. 92.
[9] *Ibid.*, XV. 135.

pushed forward the election time so that only four or five voted although several hundred were qualified.[10] At Orford "one John Hook, pretending to be Mayor (although found not to be so, upon a Trial at Bar), obtained the precept" and held an election returning two burgesses. "On the same day before the rightful Mayor" another election returned two other men. The sheriff refused the Mayor's return for that of Hook.[11]

Treating was another widespread evil leading to numerous complaints. During election season the inns and alehouses did a rushing business, to the delight of their keepers and the electorate. At Bedwin, in 1705, the voters were treated all night at the expense of two candidates; at Ludgarshall they were given "two hogsheads of drink on Easter Monday".[12] At Shoreham five days before polling, "thirty strangers came . . . and spent great sums" upon the electorate including in the treat "an Entertainment of Pullets and Wine".[13] At Newcastle under Lyme, "about Thirty Burgesses and some of their Wives" were treated at several places within a week of the election.[14]

Often treating resulted in drunkenness which disgraced elections. Testimony about the Cambridge election in 1710 gives an interesting glimpse of this manner of winning votes. One Tom Jones was made drunk and put to bed in an inn. In the morning when he meant to go to the poll, "he found himself lock'd in". When at last the door was opened, "several plied him so hard with Hotpots" that he voted for the candidate whom he intended to oppose. Mary Curd stated that when her husband declined £5 for his vote, some men "forced him violently into a Coach . . . carried him to the Bear and there made him drunk, and lock'd him up all Night; and keeping him hot" obtained his vote in the morning.[15] Defoe, who toured the country and saw many of the elections in 1708, was so aroused by the prevalence of drunkenness that he wrote, "it is not an impossible thing to debauch the nation into a choice of thieves, knaves, devils, anything, comparatively speaking, by the power of intoxications".[16]

Treating sometimes consisted of gifts of food; as at Milbourn Port, in 1702, where a defeated candidate charged that his opponent won by distributing "great Doles of Corn to many of the Electors, and also another Dole just before Election".[17]

[10] *Ibid.*, XVI. 420.
[11] *Ibid.*, XIV. 12.
[12] *Ailesbury MSS.*, pp. 193–194, 198.
[13] *Commons Journal*, XVI. 53, 263.
[14] *Ibid.*, XV. 178.
[15] *Ibid.*, XVI. 302.
[16] Walter Wilson, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe* (3 vols., London, 1830), III. 23-24.
[17] *Commons Journal*, XIV. 10.

Bribery in many and varied forms was quite common, increasing steadily during the period. In 1702 about one fifth of the petitions contesting elections charged this offense, while in 1710 the number rose to almost one half. It would seem that as the elections became more hotly contested bribery increased apace until it became general.

All sorts of bribery were practiced. Occasionally the constitutency itself suggested an action, gift, or contribution by the candidate insinuating that he would not lose thereby. Thus Thomas Coke's constituents hinted that it would be a good thing for him if he would procure "a patent for a free school" for their parish.[18] A £50 contribution to the Higham-Ferrars charity fund might be classed as a bribe in the strict sense of the term, as would be other community gifts beneficial to the recipients. For example, at Sudbury in 1702 a candidate offered £200 to help make the River Stour navigable and another £200 for a workhouse;[19] at Weymouth two candidates built a bridge and distributed the work to influence electors; at Shrewsbury, in 1708, the sitting members ordered 2,000 pairs of shoes made and the work parceled among the shoemakers of the borough.[20]

Far more common were bribes to individuals. The practice was so general in 1705 as to lead to strong comments from writers of each party. John Evelyn wrote "of the most extravagant expense to debauch and corrupt votes for Parliamentary members",[21] while Defoe exclaimed: "We have lately had two or three Acts of Parliament to prevent bribery and corruption at elections. I have already noted that we have the best laws and the worst executed of any nation in the world. Never was treating, bribing, buying of voices, freedoms, and freeholds, and all the corrupt practices in the world so open and barefaced, as since these severe laws were enacted."[22]

The following statements will give some idea of the nature, extent and size of the transactions. At Bedwin, there was a spirited election in 1705 between Lord Bruce (Tory) and Nicholas Pollexfen (Whig) in which each side bribed freely. Beecher, Bruce's agent, found the electors "all in an uproar", each man demanding £6,[23] and learned that Pollexfen was paying £5 per man, sometimes giving it "to the women under pretence of their spinning five pounds of wool at 20 shillings a pound".[24] Pollexfen, seeking a running mate, brought a man from London; but when he would offer only £4 each to seventy-five voters instead of £5 as Pollexfen had done, the latter

[18] *Coke MSS.*, III. 5.
[19] *Commons Journal*, XIV. 147, 120.
[20] *Ibid.*, XVI. 247-248; XVII. 108.
[21] John Evelyn, *Diary* (Ed. by William Bray, 2 vols., New York, 1901), II. 365.
[22] Wilson, *Defoe*, II. 362.
[23] *Ailesbury MSS.*, p. 190.
[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.

secured Sir George Byng, the admiral, who agreed to pay as much as Pollexfen and offered as high as £7 each to certain voters. Lord Bruce learned that he would have to meet these figures if he expected to win.[25] Voters receiving Pollexfen's money had to give bond, which was returned fourteen days after Parliament met if he had received their votes. At Marlborough an agent reported that "the people were very mercenary and resolved to serve the highest bidder, for they had no sort of honour or conscience, being now grown as corrupt as any other borough".[26] At Ludgarshall the prices varied; in 1705 the usual bribes ranging from one to five guineas, while the bailiff, a publican, was offered "50 guineas and a Bell".[27] Three years later the top price was £50.[28] Bribery was widespread at Huntington where, in a wine-cellar, Sir John Cotton's agent offered the burgesses a guinea each for their votes, and at least twenty-six of them took the money. Even the women had a hand in it, one Dorothy Taylor asserting that she had received forty shillings from Mrs. Cook for her husband's vote, that he had already received a guinea, and that a few days before election he was offered six guineas for his second vote for Cotton.[29] The bribes that year at Huntington varied from one to fifteen guineas; at Newcastle under Lyme, the top figure was nine guineas.

Sometimes very large sums were offered in a close election, as at Camelford where a candidate offered to spend £300 on the election and to give £20 for one vote.[30] The closeness of the poll at Old Sarum in the previous election forced Robert Pitt to pay £100 for one of the ten votes cast in that borough, which he admitted was "pretty dear; but the other side were ready to give the money" if he refused it.[31] At Devizes, in 1708, the councilmen were equally divided for two candidates, a fact which led Sir James Long to write that £500 would buy the vote of an opposition burgess, thereby winning a majority which could then elect mayor and burgesses at will and thus gain control of parliamentary elections forever.[32]

At times bribery was veiled under the guise of a business transaction with the candidate or agent buying an article from the voter. Beecher, at Marlborough, paid the mayor twenty guineas for a "sorry piece of cambric" in seeking his vote for Bruce. When he sought Tom Smith's vote, the latter replied that "if he served" Beecher would have to "take off a bargain of wood at his price".

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 190.
[27] *Commons Journal*, XV. 93-94.
[28] *Ailesbury MSS.*, p. 129.
[29] *Commons Journal*, XV. 104-105.
[30] *Ibid.*, XVI. 274.
[31] *Fortescue Manuscripts* in Royal Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports, I. 16–17.
[32] *Portland Manuscripts* in Royal Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports, IV. 486.

Beecher found the wood was worth little more than the cost of cutting although Smith asked £3 10s an acre for over sixty acres and "a promise of an ensign's commission besides for his brother". When Beecher offered £30 or £40, Smith refused stating that "he could make a better advantage on the other side".[33] Tom Jones at Cambridge in 1708 paid a half-penny a pound over the market price for a quantity of meat in his shop,[34] and at Shoreham a voter was promised an order "for a considerable quantity of cloathes [*sic*] for [a candidate's] Negroes in the Plantations".[35] At Oakhampton a candidate offered to give a voter his law business and promised an innkeeper that he "would spend 500 l. in his house and would spend 2,000 l. in the Town rather than miscarry it".[36]

Employment or an office was occasionally the form which a bribe took, as in the case of a voter of Southampton in 1702 who said that Colonel Parke promised to keep him in work and agreed to make him "Governor of his Negroes in Virginia" in return for his vote.[37] An elector at St. Albans gave his vote in return for a letter to assist him in gaining a place in the Excise.[38]

Payment of voters' debts was another practice widely used. In the 1705 election at Huntington an elector who was owed £10 or £15 on a liquor bill of a former election, was promised payment if he voted for a certain candidate.[39] The same year an agent reported that an opponent was about "paying 30 l. debts for Solomon Clarke and offers almost as much to Flurry Bowshire, so that they are wavering".[40]

Nor were these the only means by which bribery was practiced. A Leicester voter received a "pair of Breeches" and a Shrewsbury elector the promise of a horse.[41] At times candidates loaned voters money free of interest.[42] At Oakhampton, in 1705, one Hillary Macy, a Quaker condemned by the Bishop's Court for non-payment of tithes, was promised by Mr. Hussey, the minister, that he would "discharge the Costs and not prosecute him in the Future" if Macy voted for Hussey's candidate.[43] The records do not state whether Macy purchased his freedom in this manner, but they show that he had Hussey's note making the offer. Hussey was not the only cleric who engaged in shady election practices, for, among others, Mr.

[33] *Ailesbury MSS.*, pp. 196–197.
[34] *Commons Journal*, XVI. 301, 263.
[35] *Ibid.*, XVI. 263.
[36] *Ibid.*, XV. 72.
[37] *Ibid.*, XIV. 25-26.
[38] *Ibid.*, XV. 38.
[39] *Ibid.*, XV. 105.
[40] *Ailesbury MSS.*, p. 195.
[41] *Commons Journal*, XV. 136; XVI. 247-248.
[42] *Ibid.*, XV. 105.
[43] *Ibid.*, XV. 73.

Cowper, a clergyman, offered a Shrewsbury elector money for his vote in 1708.[44]

Because of the importance of the mayor as an election official and as head of the voting corporation in many boroughs, especial care was taken by candidates either to win the incumbent or to gain the election of a friendly mayor. In 1705 a Mr. Kem, newly elected mayor at Marlborough, told Lord Bruce's agent that, when he was mayor before, Lord Ailesbury gave him "2 bucks, 2 weathers, 1 calf, 2 dozen poultry, 6 geese, 6 turkeys, fish from Wolfhall and 5 dozen of wine". The agent advised Lord Bruce that if he should give Kem 10 or 12 dozen wine, as he had given the present mayor, and should "add a present of 4 or 6 pieces of beef it would win Mr. Kem's heart forever".[45]

A startling example of the part played by parliamentary candidates in mayoralty elections can be seen in the election at Marlborough in 1712 where Lord Bruce and the Duke of Somerset put up rival nominees and went the limit in effort and expense to place a henchman in the local chair. No quarter was given or asked and no trick or deceit left unused in the bitter struggle. Beecher reported that the Duke told the burgesses that "if they did not care to oblige him this time, he would never come among them more" and that he offered heavy bribes. Among others he promised Mr. Meggs £40 per year for himself and wife for their lives and a place worth £40 a year more; to John Clarke, a place in "Bluecoat Hospital worth 50 l. or 60 l. per annum, to pay his debts and to employ him in all business at his farms".[46] Upon Clarke's refusal, the Duke then offered him £200 ready money. He agreed to give Solomon Clarke £20 for himself and wife for their lives, £30 in money, and other things. All these declined the offers, Solomon Clarke vowing that he would not serve the Duke "if he gave him the castle and the barton farms".[47] Thomas Hunt needed £150 mortgage money whereupon the Duke offered him the money in return for the mortgage, but Hunt refused and sought Bruce's agent for his offer. Somerset won the aid of John Smith by giving him £100 down, by agreeing to educate Smith's seven year old son at school and the University, and to present him to a good living when he was ready for it. To offset Smith's defection Beecher bought Flurry Bowshire for 40 guineas and Richard Rogers for £13 and possibly £8 more payable after the votes were delivered. As these men were not suspected of deserting the Duke, Bowshire was "incognito" and Rogers

[44] *Ibid.*, XVI. 247-248.
[45] *Ailesbury MSS.*, pp. 192–193.
[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 206-207.
[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 204, 206-207.

in hiding.[48] Beecher said such heavy expenditure was necessary, for if the other side won they intended to bring in Whig burgesses and thus secure control of the elections thereafter. Soon after the election, which Bruce's man won, Beecher urged Lord Bruce to obtain a bookkeeper's position worth £30 and board for Thomas Smith's son, and a place in the Excise for the son of Solomon Clarke, saying that the fathers deserved to be rewarded for "they have withstood great temptation" in not yielding to the Duke's offers.[49]

When treats and bribes failed, resort was had to threats, intimidation, and even force. At the 1705 election at Leicester, John North, sergeant of militia, was threatened with being "put out" unless he voted for a certain man, while at other places voters "were threatened to be sent away as Soldiers" or to sea.[50] At Newcastle under Lyme, some electors owing agents money were threatened with jail unless they gave their votes, and a Bedwin man was threatened with a suit for a £6 debt which would be remitted if he voted correctly.[51] A Cambridge elector promised his vote to escape having "all his goods seized for arrears of rent", and another voter, fined for keeping a disorderly house, received a promise of relief from further prosecution in return for his vote.[52] Loss of work and office were often used as clubs over voters to obtain their votes, as for example at Marlborough in 1708 when the mayor "sent for all his officers and told them that they should serve Mr. Bruce point blank or turn out".[53]

Nor was the use of force rare. In 1705 a Leicester elector "was forced into . . . a Cellar, where he found a great many other Voters and was kept all Night" until the election, while a party of fourscore were kept in an agent's house so long that they threatened to break the windows if they were not released.[54] When a Bedwin elector after being treated intended to leave with "about 16 more votes", the group were betrayed by the rival candidate's agent and "all the night kept close in a room like prisoners and not suffered to whisper to one another . . . and not to stir out of doors . . . but under guard" of the candidate's servants.[55]

Violent rioting not infrequently enlivened and disgraced the elections. Of the 1710 election Burnet wrote, "in a word the practice and violence used now in elections, went far beyond anything that I have ever known in England . . . and, if free elections are

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 208.
[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 208-209.
[50] *Commons Journal*, XV. 44, 94, 135–136.
[51] *Ibid.*, XV. 178; XVI. 263.
[52] *Ibid.*, XVI. 301.
[53] *Ailesbury MSS.*, p. 200; *cf. Ibid.*, p. 193; *Commons Journal*, XV. 135–136.
[54] *Commons Journal*, XV. 136.
[55] *Ailesbury MSS.*, pp. 193–194.

necessary to the being of a parliament, there was good reason to doubt if there was a true representative elected".[56] Of the London election Defoe declared, "Honest men have been afraid to come to the poll, for fear of being abused; and many that have attempted it have been so beaten and bruised, that they thought it a happiness to get safe back again, without getting up to the books, and so have not polled at all".[57] Two or three instances of rioting must suffice in supporting the above statements. At Southwark, in 1702, occurred "a great Riot and Tumult" caused by ten or more of the draymen of Charles Cox (a candidate) wearing "grey Hats and red Ribbands". They, with the servants of Cox's brother-in-law, cleared the polling place of those supporting Cox's opponent and kept others from coming, thus ending the poll and winning the election.[58] Even the constables and officers to keep the peace were beaten. At Chester the Whig cry in 1705 was "Down with the Church and the Bishops" says a news letter of the time. When sixty clergymen came to vote, the "Whiggish rabble" cried, "Hell was broke loose, and these were the Devil's black guard" and began a riot resulting in the breaking of the cathedral windows.[59] At Honiton, Defoe reported a "terrible mob election" which so cowed the defeated candidate that he dared not petition.[60]

Perhaps the worst case of rioting during the period took place at Coventry in 1705. The authorities, fearing violence, ordered that only qualified voters should come to the poll and that "none should come with Sticks". One officer stated that the night before election he set a strong watch. About 1 a. m. he took a walk and saw "some Butchers and others . . . rallying with Sticks which he took away, . . . afterwards, the Numbers increasing, . . . he was called out again about Four" and saw stones flying about. He dispersed the company, but "a half an Hour after he was called out again, they appearing with Sticks, and having knocked down one William Matthews, a Watchman, and dragged him about in such manner, that some time after he died; and that himself attempting to take away a Butcher's Stick, a great Pebble was thrown at him, which cut him".[61] Another witness testified that they threw stones at the mayor forcing him to withdraw "into his Parlour"; that a voter was "horsed" *i. e.*, "carried on a Cowlestaff on two Men's shoulders"; that a party "fell upon the Halberdiers, took away their Halberds, and beat them"; and that when some appeared to vote,

[56] Burnet, *op. cit.*, I. 16.
[57] Wilson, *Defoe*, III. 168.
[58] *Commons Journal*, XIV. 24-25.
[59] *Portland MSS.*, IV. 189.
[60] *Ibid.*, IV. 270.
[61] *Commons Journal*, XV. 276.

a crowd of 500 prevented their doing so, crying "No Freemen. A Horse, A Horse, A Horse". Next day some voters were "horsed and dragged in the dirt". An elector attempting to vote was attacked by the mob who "pulled his Clothes almost off his back"; another was "knocked on the Pate" and carried before the magistrate who sent him to Bridewell; another was knocked down, carried out for dead, and "laid on a Tombstone in the Church Yard". Still another tried three times to vote. At last he succeeded, but immediately thereafter "they fell upon him, and one took him by the Collar, and", as he thought, "had strangled him, if his Collar had not broke". He lay eleven weeks, before he could help himself and later was in the hospital. Testimony of the mayor and aldermen amply substantiated these accounts of violence and lawlessness which all too often swayed elections.[62]

These corrupt practices did not pass unnoticed. They resulted in numerous petitions to the House where they were either heard at the Bar or referred to the Committee of Elections for investigation and report. Such action did not always result in justice for all too often the witnesses were persons of low character not above testifying for whoever paid the greater reward. Moreover, since contested elections were decided by vote of the House, bitter partisanship usually settled the question, and victory lay with the majority party. Both parties were guilty during Anne's reign, of using their majorities to strengthen their control of the House, thus adding to evils which steadily became worse until an awakened and indignant public opinion at last swept away the worst of the corrupt practices, although they have not been completely eliminated in England—or elsewhere, for that matter.

[62] *Ibid.*, XV. 276–278; *Portland MSS.*, IV. 187–188.

THE GRANGER MOVEMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA

J. H. EASTERBY
College of Charleston

It is customary to think of the Grange—as it is the custom in this country to think of practically all expressions of agrarian discontent—as a Western movement, and such an attitude is not without reason. The Grange was conceived by a Western farmer; it has had its greatest activity and has achieved most in the Middle Western States; and, what is more important, it has been essentially Western in spirit. But the Grange has not been limited to the West; it has been nation-wide in its scope.[1] Of its several sectional phases, however, the Western is unquestionably the best, the Southern probably the least understood. The Granger movement, for instance, has never been directly studied as a clew to the social revolution which has taken place in the South since the War of Secession; and yet, if Granger activities in South Carolina, one of the leading Southern states, may be taken as typical of those in the South at large, such a point of view is essential.[2]

In reality, the Grange was originally planned for the South. In the winter and spring of the year 1866, a certain Oliver Hudson Kelley, clerk in the Federal Bureau of Agriculture, traveled through the Southern States gathering "statistical and other information", especially with regard to agricultural and mineral resources. He was shocked by conditions which he found among the farmers and planters, conditions which he ascribed not only to the recent war but to a general apathy which prevailed among them. The conviction, moreover, was borne in upon him that "the politicians would never restore peace in the country; if it came at all, it must be through fraternity. The people of North and South must know each other as members

[1] For an excellent critical examination of the Granger Movement in the United States as a whole see Solon J. Buck, *The Granger Movement: A Study of Agricultural Organization and Its Political, Economic and Social Manifestations, 1870-1880* (1913). This is summarized by the same author in the first five chapters of *The Agrarian Crusade* (1920). Several studies of the Grange in particular states, e. g., A. E. Paine, *The Granger Movement in Illinois,* University of Illinois Bulletin, II, No. 2 (1904), have been made. Outstanding among contemporary accounts are: Oliver Hudson Kelley, *Origin and Progress of the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry* (1875), Edward W. Martin (pseud. of J. D. McCabe), *History of the Granger Movement* (1874), and David Wyatt Aiken, *The Grange: Its Origin, Progress, and Educational Purposes,* Department of Agriculture, Special Report No. 55 (1883).

[2] The materials for a study of the Granger Movement in South Carolina are fairly abundant. The present writer has drawn mainly from the *Minutes of the State Grange* (manuscript in the possession of The Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C.), the existence of which was called to his attention by Professors W. H. Mills and A. G. Holmes of that institution; *The Rural Carolinian* (Charleston and Cokesbury, 1869–1876); and *The News, The Daily Courier,* and *The News and Courier* (Charleston).

of the same great family, and all sectionalism be abolished". Being "something more than a mere collector of data", Kelley gave thought to possible plans to alleviate the situation. As he lingered in Charleston and its vicinity, as Northern travelers have ever been wont to do, he resolved to devote his energies to the discovery and application of a remedy, and out of this resolution there was evolved an idea which ultimately found expression through the organization of a national secret society of farmers—the Patrons of Husbandry, or, as it is commonly called, the Grange.[3]

It was natural that this particular man should have hit upon this particular remedy. A majority of the Southern people, whom Kelley wished especially to help, were engaged in agriculture. He was himself a farmer who, when not employed in government service, lived among farmers who were suffering, in a measure, from the same inertia which affected those of the South. To the farmer, then, he turned as a common denominator, as it were, of all sections of the country. Kelley, moreover, was an enthusiastic Mason, and he had noticed in his "intercourse with the [Southern] planters that it was evidently no disadvantage to be a member of the Masonic fraternity".[4] Hence the secrecy, the degrees, signs and passwords which became prominent features of the Grange Order. The more he thought of it the more he came to be convinced that there was "nothing else that could restore peace and quiet between North and South".[5]

To allay sectional animosities, and thereby hasten the economic rehabilitation of the Southern farmer, was one of the chief considerations which prompted the establishment of the Grange. But in the course of its early development, under the difficulties which its organizer had to labor, this object was partially obscured. In Washington, Kelley gathered about him six associates, for the most part government clerks like himself. Together they "worked out a ritual . . . framed a constitution, adopted a motto—*Esto perpetua*"—and, on December 4, 1867, constituted themselves the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry. Early the next year Kelley, who had been elected secretary, resigned his clerkship and, "with two dollars and a half in his pocket, started out to work his way to [his home in] Minnesota by organizing Granges [subordinate or local chapters]". When his journey was over he had established only four, and three of these were not to be permanent. The Order was in debt, and the founders in Washington were discouraged. But in Minnesota the undaunted Kelley worked with better results. By the end of 1869 the

[3] O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-15; O. H. Kelley to Col. Benjamin Allston, manuscript in possession of Mrs. Jane (Allston) Hill, Charleston, S. C.
[4] O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

Grange had taken firm root in that state. Before the close of the next year it had made its way into nine states, and preparations were being made for its introduction into seven others. The center of the movement was the upper Mississippi Valley: Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Illinois. Thus far there was not a single Grange in the Southern States.[6]

During the next five years the growth of the Order was rapid. On October 1, 1875, there were in the United States over 19,000 subordinate Granges with a membership of 758,767 persons.[7] It had penetrated every state in the Union, save Rhode Island, and in the South had found an enthusiastic acceptance. It was at last at work bringing about the better relationship between North and South which Kelley had originally hoped to secure. When the Grange entered the South, however, this object had become incidental. The organizers were now emphasizing its educational and social advantages, and the rank and file of the organization had their eyes upon the material benefits which it was thought to hold in store for them.

There is a special appropriateness, in view of the fact that the idea of the Grange had occurred to Kelley during his visit in Charleston,[8] that the Order was introduced into the Southern States through that city. The way for this was prepared by Dr. Daniel Harrison Jacques,[9] who, having come to Charleston probably from Florida, had begun in October, 1869, the publication of *The Rural Carolinian,* a magazine devoted to "agriculture, horticulture, and the industrial arts".[10] In the December issue of 1870 Jacques wrote favorably of the Patrons of Husbandry.[11] Kelley saw this article and with characteristic promptness entered upon a correspondence with the editor which resulted in the appointment of the latter as General Deputy of the National Grange for South Carolina.[12]

Jacques at once began a vigorous editorial campaign in the interests of the Order, but he had no time to go into the field. At his suggestion, therefore, William E. Simmons, Jr., an "agent" of the Charleston *Daily News,* was made Special Deputy for Charleston with au-

[6] S. J. Buck, *The Agrarian Crusade,* ch. 1.

[7] See table, "Statistics of the Patrons of Husbandry" in S. J. Buck, *The Granger Movement,* following p. 58.

[8] This honor was several times claimed for Charleston and never, to the knowledge of the writer, refuted.—*The Rural Carolinian,* VI (March, 1875). 312.

[9] In addition to having practiced medicine, Jacques was the author of *Hints toward Physical Perfection* (1859), *The Garden* (1861), and *The Farm* (1866).—*Library of Southern Literature,* XV. 220; obituary articles in the Charleston *News and Courier,* Sept. 1, 1877, and Feb. 4, 1878.

[10] See the editor's salutatory, *The Rural Carolinian,* I (October, 1869).

[11] In an earlier issue (I, December, 1869, p. 184) *The Rural Carolinian* had advocated the establishment of farmers' clubs without special reference to the Patrons of Husbandry.

[12] This correspondence is printed in O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.,* pp. 291 *et seq.*

thority to organize Granges in any part of the State.[13] These two men aroused the interest of a small group of citizens with the result that on May 24, 1871, application was made for a dispensation for Ashley Grange No. 1, the first subordinate Grange to be organized in the Southern States.[14] There were twenty-four charter members—seventeen men and seven women. Of the men, seven were farmers or planters, two factors, one publisher, an editor, a newspaper "agent", an architect, a baker, a grocer, a railway clerk, and a dry goods merchant. Of the women, six appear to have been wives and one a sister of an equal number of male members.[15] This would seem to be a strange personnel of a farmers' club, but so liberally was the rule of eligibility interpreted that it was not uncommon to find such groups in Granges that were established in cities.

But the success of the Patrons of Husbandry in South Carolina was by no means assured with the organization of Ashley Grange No. 1. There was a good deal of inertia to be overcome in the class for which it was intended before it could gain a general acceptance. There was even some positive opposition. Jacques feared that "our people are somewhat inclined to suspect ulterior political objects in movements originating at the North, or in Washington", or, as another friend of the Grange put it, "the Southern Bourbon accuses the Order of being an 'ism' from Yankee land".[16] It was another secret organization "to widen the breach between the races". There was too much power vested in the National Grange. Because women were admitted to membership, it was said to be a woman's rights movement. It interfered with the legitimate work of the older agricultural societies.[17] So ran the objections that were voiced.[18] These did not, however, constitute as serious an obstacle as it might be inferred. The real hindrance to the progress of the Grange in South Carolina during these first months was the lack of a vigorous organizing officer, one who could carry its appeal into the small communities where the farmers lived and preach its doctrines with religious fervor.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 320.

[14] S. J. Buck, *The Granger Movement*, p. 51.

[15] O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-329. The occupations of the members have been taken from the *Charleston Directory of 1872–1873.*

[16] Jacques to Kelley, O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.*, p. 291; *The Rural Carolinian*, III (June, 1872). 449–451.

[17] To the contrary in this respect cordial relations existed from the outset with the South Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical Society (the old State Agricultural Society of South Carolina reorganized under a new name, April, 1869), and beginning in 1879 the two organizations held joint summer meetings for several years.—*History of the State Agricultural Society of South Carolina* (1916) and *MS. Minutes of the State Grange, Annual Session, 1879.*

[18] These objections, for the most part, are summarized in an article entitled "How I Came to be a Patron", *The Rural Carolinian*, III (December, 1871). 115-118.

Such a man was at length found in Col. David Wyatt Aiken, who, on Jacques's recommendation, was appointed Deputy at Large for the Southern States in December, 1871. There could hardly have been found in South Carolina a better leader for the Grange. Aiken was a graduate of South Carolina College, an ex-Confederate Colonel, a newspaper writer of considerable experience, and a successful farmer of Abbeville County. Besides, he was a forceful speaker, and at the time of his appointment he was Secretary and Treasurer of the South Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical Society.[19] From the outset he gave himself whole-heartedly to the cause. Kelley had been favorably impressed with Aiken, but he was not prepared for the great success which the latter achieved. "On April 4th (1872)," the Secretary wrote, "if lightning had come into our office, we could not have been more surprised than we were to receive two applications (his first work), sent in by Col. D. Wyatt Aiken. . . ." By the end of the month eight more applications came in from South Carolina and "a flood of letters and newspapers from the South".[20]

By October 9, 1872, seventy-six subordinate Granges had been established in South Carolina, and on that date a State or Central Grange was instituted.[21] One hundred and twenty-five delegates gathered in Columbia, adopted a constitution and elected Thomas Taylor, of that city, Master. Aiken was chosen Secretary. "No State Grange in the Union," Kelley said, "had been organized upon so strong a basis."[22] When this body assembled again three months later (January 15–16, 1873), the number of Granges had increased to one hundred and four, making South Carolina second in this respect among all the states.[23] By way of recognition of this, Taylor and Aiken were chosen respectively Overseer and Member of the Executive Committee of the National Grange at its next annual meeting.[24]

But progress did not halt here. Dr. John A. Barksdale, of Laurens, who succeeded Aiken as chief organizing officer for the State, proved himself to be, if possible, more indefatigable in this part of the work than his predecessor had been.[25] By 1875 he had achieved the dis-

[19] J. H. Easterby, "David Wyatt Aiken," *Dictionary of American Biography*, I. 127.

[20] O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

[21] *MS. Minutes, Annual Session, February, 1875.*

[22] *The Rural Carolinian*, IV (October, 1872). 36; IV (November, 1872). 88-90; Charleston *News and Courier*, Oct. 11, 1872.

[23] *MS. Minutes, Annual Session, 1872; The Rural Carolinian*, IV (January, 1873). 214; *Ibid.*, IV (February, 1873). 258; S. J. Buck, *The Granger Movement*, p. 55. Iowa held first place at this time.

[24] *The Rural Carolinian*, IV (February, 1873). 259. On May 19, 1873, South Carolina was still leading the Southern States, but soon after that Mississippi and later other states outranked her in point of numbers.—S. J. Buck, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

[25] *Eminent and Representative Men of the Carolinas*, I. 316-317.

tinction of having organized more subordinate Granges—something over two hundred—than any other officer in the United States.[26] When the third annual session of the State Grange was held in February, 1875, the Granger movement in South Carolina had reached its height; there were 332 Granges and more than 10,000 members.[27]

The activities of the Grange in South Carolina were in most respects similar to those in other states. It was, in general, the purpose of the Order to advance the welfare of the farmers in every possible way—intellectually, socially, economically, and politically. In South Carolina, as elsewhere, the leaders emphasized its educational advantages. Aiken expressed the attitude of hundreds of farmers toward this feature: "A vast majority of them [Southern farmers]," he said, "were youths without education in 1861, when the tocsin of war was sounded, who with a patriotism that was and is not, sacrificed home and education that our land might be self-governed; . . . now without training they have to fight the battles of life, . . . by association with each other in the Grange, they strike the flint and steel of their minds together, and create an intellectual flame that illumines the entire agricultural community."[28] The State Grange took up the cause of vocational training for farmers. In 1875 an unsuccessful attempt was made to lay the foundation of an endowment for an agricultural college.[29] Shortly after the State University was restored to the white people, the Patrons urged the importance of including "scientific agriculture and mechanical education" in its curriculum and had the satisfaction of seeing the institution reopened in 1880 under the name of the South Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanics.[30] A part of the program of every Grange meeting

[26] O. H. Kelley, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

[27] *The Rural Carolinian,* VII (December, 1876). 556-558. Professor Buck (*The Granger Movement,* table, p. 58) estimates the number of members on October 1, 1875, to have been 10,922. Aiken stated in the *News and Courier* (February 1, 1878) that there had been at one time 12,500 Patrons in South Carolina but gave no date. The greatest number of Granges active in the state at any one time was probably 332, but new ones were organized after 1875. For lists see contemporary issues of *The Rural Carolinian.* The fact that Hartford Grange, Newberry County, now bears the number 460 would seem to indicate that there have been that many Granges established.—*The South Carolina State Grange, Official Roster (1931).* Abandonment of Granges, however, exceeded the increase.

[28] *The Rural Carolinian,* VII (March, 1876). 121-122.

[29] *MS. Minutes, Annual Session, February, 1875.*

[30] *MS. Minutes, Summer Session, 1877,* and *Annual Session, 1878.* By subsequent reorganizations the emphasis on agriculture and mechanics was diminished in the interest of liberal arts and sciences, but an active college of agriculture and mechanic arts and several experimental farms were maintained until 1891 when a more radical farmers' movement led by Benjamin R. Tillman succeeded in establishing the Clemson Agricultural College. J. N. Lipscomb, Master of the State Grange (1877-1887) was, as a member of the board of Trustees of the University, an active supporter of the agricultural department.—Edwin L. Green, *A History of the University of South Carolina,* chs. 8–10.

was designed to be instructive. This might be a lecture, an essay, or a debate on some pertinent subject. Members sometimes availed themselves of club rates offered by magazine and newspaper publishers, and occasionally a Grange established a library.[31] Doubtless the results were disappointing to many, but there is no doubt that the Grange gave a measure of intellectual stimulus to the farmer class of the state.

The social features drew into the Order numbers of farmers and their wives and daughters. They found in it a means of pleasant intercourse which many did not otherwise have. Social hours when Grange songs were sung from a Grange songbook, accompanied on a Grange organ,[32] suppers on special occasions, and picnics which often brought the members of several Granges together were thoroughly enjoyed. The women were much in evidence on such occasions. One Patron raised his voice in complaint against this, saying: "Why, a ploughboy can't get up to give his aspirations, but that they [the women] are ready to laugh him down. Yes, every one of them, except, perhaps, she whose particular friend the ploughboy may happen to be. . . ." [33] But on the whole the matrons were welcome members.

Like most fraternal orders, the Grange endeavored to relieve distress among its members. On at least one occasion the Patrons of South Carolina were substantially reminded of this feature of their Order. In 1876 a number of planters of Barnwell, Beaufort, and Colleton Counties were in desperate straits on account of crop failures. They appealed to the National Grange for aid, and in response $1,000 was appropriated for their relief. This caused Aiken to have "an appreciation of our Order that with all my enthusiasm I have never before experienced".[34]

Unquestionably many, perhaps the majority of the members, were led to join the Grange by the promise of material benefits which it held out. Early in the history of the Order in South Carolina the Master of Concord Grange, No. 39 (Sumter County), reported enthusiastically: "The Grange has purchased bagging and ties for its members at a saving of at least five cents a yard, and also flour, saving about four dollars a barrel. Manufacturers and others evidently see the handwriting on the wall."[35] Somewhat later the Granges in Anderson County clubbed their orders for fertilizer at a saving of

[31] *The Rural Carolinian*, IV (June, 1873). 493.

[32] "The Farmers' Song," words and music by Miss Julia Leverett, of Columbia, S. C., was awarded a prize by the National Grange in 1873.—*Ibid.*, V (October, 1873). 55.

[33] *Ibid.*, V (May, 1874). 440.

[34] S. J. Buck, *The Granger Movement*, p. 284; *The Rural Carolinian*, VII (January, 1876). 25-26; (March, 1876). 122; (May, 1876). 222-223; (July, 1876). 314.

[35] *Ibid.*, IV (October, 1872). 36-37.

about $4,000.[36] The advantages of collective buying and selling were quickly recognized by other Granges, and in 1874 the State Grange established in Columbia a central purchasing bureau with a salaried official in charge and designated representatives in St. Louis and New York.[37] About the same time an agent was appointed in Charleston to transact Grange business upon a commission basis.[38] The co-operative store was seriously considered but was not so generally adopted in South Carolina as in other states.[39] By these devices and others the farmers sought to eliminate the middlemen "Who," as one Granger said, "neither toil nor spin, and yet 'Solomon in all his glory is not arrayed like one of them', . . . these kindly, charitable . . . 'lillies of the field' ".[40] But their success, encouraging at first, was to be only temporary.

In a variety of other ways, but with less tangible results, the Grange and Grange leaders endeavored by such means as they could command to promote the economic advancement of the farmer class. To solve the labor problem created by the emancipation of the Negroes, vigorous efforts were made to encourage immigration from Europe and the Northern States.[41] Various expedients were employed with the view of convincing the farmer that improved and diversified agriculture should be adopted in the place of the prevailing single-crop system and that prosperity could not be attained until the credit system was abolished.[42] Steps were taken to establish direct trade between the South and the Northwest and between Charleston and European ports.[43] Plans for a Patrons' Phosphate Company, a Pa-

[36] *Ibid.*, VII (June, 1876). 266-267.

[37] Charleston *News and Courier*, February 21, 1874. The business of this agency increased from $33,807 in 1874 to $85,471 in 1875.—*MS. Minutes, Annual Session, December, 1875.*

[38] The Charleston agent reported that in 1879 he had handled 1,710 bales of cotton and purchases to the amount of $14,767 for Patrons and reduced the storage rates on cotton in the city by 50 per cent.—*MS. Minutes, Annual Session, 1875.*

[39] A co-operative store was maintained for some time in Anderson County.—*MS. Minutes, Annual Session, 1878.* Another was established in Marlboro County.—*Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of S. C., 1878*, pp. 451-452.

[40] *The Rural Carolinian*, IV (July, 1873), 543–546.

[41] *Ibid.*, V (May, 1874). 423; V (February, 1874). 255; VI (October, 1875). 701–702; VI (December, 1875). 816–817; VII (May, 1876). 219; *MS. Minutes, Annual Session, 1873.* In 1874 the State Grange contributed $1,000 toward the establishment of the Immigration Bureau at Charleston. *News and Courier*, February 21, 1874.

[42] Almost every number of *The Rural Carolinian* carried one or more articles on these subjects; Aiken was the author of many of them. The most ambitious scheme to encourage diversification was a system of crop reports to be conducted by the State Grange, but this was never actually put into operation. Union County Granges, however, instituted a similar system among themselves.—*MS. Minutes, Annual Session, December, 1875; The Rural Carolinian*, IV (July, 1873). 546-547; IV (September, 1873). 660-661.

[43] *Ibid.*, V (July, 1874). 542; V (August, 1874). 592; VI (December, 1874). 146-147.

trons' Bank, a Patrons' Mutual Insurance Association, joint stock farming companies, joint stock cotton factories, and Grange-owned warehouses were discussed either at the annual meetings of the State Grange or in the columns of *The Rural Carolinian*.[44] In short, the Patrons of Husbandry seemed bent on establishing a farmers' Utopia. To put its many features into practice, however, was quite another matter.

To secure legislation favorable to the farmer class was a leading feature of the Grange program. In South Carolina the government was not accessible to Democratic Patrons as long as the Republican party remained in power. After 1876, however, the Grange addressed its petitions to the legislature with important results. Instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts was introduced into the State University. In 1877 the executive committee of the State Grange was authorized to "memorialize the Legislature on the subject of railroad freights, and to lay before that body the discrimination between through and local freights, and all other grievances connected with railroads". The result was the establishment the next year of the office of Railroad Commissioner with power to hear complaints and adjust grievances.[45] Largely, if not entirely, as a result of Grange influence an act was passed in 1879 creating a Department of Agriculture with the Master of the State Grange as a member of its board.[46] Contemporary acts regulating traffic in seed cotton after dark, the stock law of 1881, and similar measures are also traceable to Grange influence.[47] In the Federal Congress David Wyatt Aiken became the chief sponsor of the bill, finally adopted in 1889, which gave the Bureau of Agriculture cabinet rank.[48]

In spite, however, of these achievements and still greater achievements which the leaders predicted, the Granger movement was alrady on the wane in South Carolina. Before any one of the measures which the Patrons advocated were passed into law by the legislature, their numerical strength was declining. The Order had reached its height when the National Grange held its eighth annual session in

[44] Most of these ideas got no further than the point of suggestion. Plans for farming companies and cotton factories, however, were carefully worked out.—*Ibid.*, VI (June, 1875). 474; VI (December, 1875). 817–818; VI (October, 1875). 703-704.

[45] *MS. Minutes, Summer Session, 1877; Annual Sessions, 1878 and 1879; Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of South Carolina, 1878,* pp. 789-792. The more drastic restrictive legislation of 1882 was probably due, in part at least, to Grange influence.—*Ibid.*, 1881–1882, pp. 791–843.

[46] *MS. Minutes, Annual Sessions, December, 1875, 1877, 1878, 1880; Acts and Joint Resolutions, 1879,* pp. 72–75; *A Review of the Operations of the Department of Agriculture of South Carolina* (1885).

[47] See lists of acts in *Acts and Joint Resolutions, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881-1882.*

[48] J. H. Easterby, "David Wyatt Aiken," *Dictionary of American Biography,* I. 127; *The National Grange Monthly,* XXV (November, 1928). 6.

Charleston in February, 1875. As early as 1873 some doubt was expressed regarding the zeal of the rank and file.[49] During the following year it was noted that interest was "flagging", and by 1875 the decline was unmistakable. The number of Granges increased from 332 in February to 358 in December, but 122 of these had surrendered their charters. Aiken felt that the time had come "to sound the tocsin of alarm", but the disintegration was not to be arrested. As the year drew to its close it was found necessary to reduce the expenses of the State Grange. The Columbia agent was discharged, and the secretary was authorized to perform his duties. The salaries of other officers were reduced.[50] *The Rural Carolinian,* which had become a sort of semi-official organ of the Order, ceased publication in December, 1876, on account of lack of subscribers. Of 382 Granges organized previous to 1880, only 98 were active in February of that year.[51]

The Grange declined in South Carolina, in the main, for the same reasons which account for its decline in the United States as a whole. In point of time the one parallels the other. There was too much inertia, "unaccountable apathy" as Barksdale put it, in the farmer class to permit early enthusiasms to be sustained. There was disappointment over the material benefits which the individual member realized. "Many expected," wrote one disheartened Patron, "that the Grange was going to coin money by some hocus-pocus unexplained, or that some good old mythical Santa Claus would come around, and the everhanging stocking would be kept constantly full of mint drops . . .".[52] The mistake was made of admitting to membership persons who were not in sympathy with the farmers' cause. To some it seemed that the State Grange had embarked upon too ambitious and too expensive a program at the outset, making retrenchment inevitable. Many found it difficult under the pressure of hard times to pay dues. There was dissatisfaction with the policies of the National Grange. All these causes contributed to disintegration. One additional factor operated with special force in South Carolina. In 1876 the farmer was absorbed in politics—in the struggle to restore white supremacy.[53] He had interests for the time being that were vastly more

[49] *The Rural Carolinian,* II (February, 1873). 257-258.

[50] *MS. Minutes, Annual Session, December, 1875.*

[51] *Ibid., 1880.* After this date the Grange practically ceased to exist in South Carolina. In 1902 it was revived but became dormant again three years later. In 1930 it was again revived, and, though its membership is not large as yet, it appears to be in a healthy condition.

[52] *The Rural Carolinian,* VI (November, 1875). 761-762.

[53] It is practically impossible to determine from the evidence at hand to what extent and in what way, if any, the Order figured in the campaign of 1876. The Grange as an organization was not permitted to go into politics, and it does not appear that any considerable number of Patrons offered for election as individual citizens. It seems unlikely, however, that Grange gather-

important than those of his particular class. Under the circumstances an organization peculiar to that class was naturally neglected. In the flush of victory and its immediate aftermath the farmer gave up, temporarily at least, something of his class consciousness. When this consciousness was restored, he preferred to give expression to it through the more radical organization known as the Farmers Alliance.[54]

The Grange has unquestionably contributed something toward the advancement of the farmer class of South Carolina. In spite of the failure to put into effect many of its most important features, it has taught the farmer valuable lessons in economics and has given him opportunities for social and intellectual improvement which he might not otherwise have had. It initiated for him a policy of seeking legislation which under increasing pressure has become more favorable to his interests than to those of any other class in the state. But, taken all in all, the Granger movement is more important for what it stands for—for what it led to eventually—than for what it actually accomplished. It is, without a doubt, an early manifestation of the social and economic revolution which has been in progress in the state since the close of the War of Secession.

In the first place, the Grange was essentially a movement of farmers rather than of planters. Planters there were among its members and even among its leaders, but they were few in number and influence as compared with the farmers. There was, moreover, a disposition, often apparent, to criticize adversely the ways of the old régime.[55] In the second place, it was an up-country rather than a low-country movement. This is revealed not only in the geographic distribution of subordinate Granges but also in the whole character

ings, after the "gates" were closed, were neglected as a means of organizing the white Democracy. Dr. S. T. D. Lancaster, the present master of Spartanburg Pomona Grange who was a member of the Order in 1876, recalls that such was the case. It may not be without significance that Wade Hampton, a member of the Grange who was later chosen to lead the Democrats, accepted an invitation to address the Grange at its annual convention in February, 1875, and that David Wyatt Aiken was one of the two congressmen elected by the Democrats.

[54] See F. B. Simkins, *The Tillman Movement in South Carolina* (1926). Mr. Simkins, I think, underrates the importance of the Granger movement as an antecedent of Tillmanism.

[55] Among the planters whom Kelley visited in 1866 and later wrote concerning his plan to organize the Patrons of Husbandry was Col. Benjamin Allston, eldest son of the late Governor R. F. W. Allston, a leading rice-planter of the low-country.—Kelley to Allston, ms. in the possession of Mrs. Jane (Allston) Hill, Charleston, S. C. Allston was for several years an active leader in Grange affairs. An examination of the available lists of members reveals, however, that the planters were distinctly in the minority. "The times are so changed," said one Patron, "that the term planter, as significant of a hundred bales and thousands of acres, cannot often be used."—*The Rural Carolinian*, VI (January, 1874). 92-93. Aiken was outspoken in his criticism of the planter and his methods.—See, for example, *Ibid.*, VII (January, 1876). 25-26.

of Granger activities.[56] In short, it is an indication of the transfer of the control of the state's policy from planter to farmer, from low-country to up-country, which has taken place in the last half-century. One of its members touched the heart of the whole matter when he said: "Here in the South we formerly had a class of highly educated planters (and it is not entirely extinct, thank God!), the members of which could and did wield the brain-power, of which we have spoken, and made themselves powerful, for good ends, in public affairs; but that class was always comparatively small, and, as a distinct class, must soon disappear. What we want now is a general diffusion of education—a cultivation and development of the brain in the whole farming class. With that will come independence, mental and pecuniary, self-reliance and public influence. To bring about this new and better state of things, should be among the most important objects of the Patrons of Husbandry. It is a good thing that the Granges enable us to buy a plough and a barrel of flour at twenty per cent. discount, . . . but it is a better thing that they may, and necessarily must, ultimately increase the area and culture of that little but valuable domain which lies under the dome of the skull."[57] David Wyatt Aiken and his co-workers may not have been accepted disciples of Benjamin Ryan Tillman, who reorganized the farmers' movement in the 1880's and carried it to greater triumphs, but they spoke with the voices of the prophets who foretold the coming of Tillmanism.[58]

[56] Of the 332 subordinate Granges organized prior to February, 1875, the largest number for which accurate information as to location is available, 196 were above and 136 below the Fall Line. *The Rural Carolinian* listed the Granges as they were organized up to 1875. The lack of interest on the part of the low-country was the subject of frequent comment by the editor. For instance, he deplored the fact that at the annual session of the State Grange in December, 1875, "the eastern half of the state was scarcely represented at all". *Ibid.*, VII (January, 1876). 34.

[57] *Ibid.*, VI (November, 1874). 93.

[58] I have been told by a former Tillmanite that Aiken was not a supporter of Tillman. This, however, does not necessarily invalidate the statement above.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

ACHURCH, R. W.....Charleston, S. C.
Assistant Professor of English, The Citadel

ANDERSON, REBECCA.....Greenwood, S. C.
Greenwood High School

BAKER, MARY N.....Columbia, S. C.
University of S. C.

BASKERVILLE, ELIZABETH.....Orangeburg, S. C.
Orangeburg High School

BIGGER, DR. DAVID A.....Rock Hill, S. C.

BLANKS, JAS. B.....Gaffney, S. C.
Associate Professor of Education, Limestone College

BLUMÉ, VERA.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School

BONN, E. T.....Columbia, S. C.
Associate Professor of History, University of S. C.

BOYD, RUTH.....Newberry, S. C.
Newberry High School

BROWN, M. W.....Clinton, S. C.
Professor of History, Presbyterian College

CALHOUN, A. W.....Gaffney, S. C.
Professor of History, Limestone College

CALLCOTT, W. H.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of History, University of S. C.

CAUTHEN, C. E.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of History, Columbia College

CHILDS, MRS. ARNEY R.....Columbia, S. C.
Principal, Logan School

CHILDS, ST. JULIEN R.....Charleston, S. C.
Assistant Professor of History, The Citadel

CLAYTON, CHRISTINE.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School

COLEMAN, J. K.....Charleston, S. C.
Associate Professor of History, The Citadel

CROSLAND, H. H., JR.....Columbia, S. C.
University of S. C.

DANIEL, D. W.....Clemson College, S. C.
Professor of English, Clemson College

DAVIS, HENRY C.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of English, University of South Carolina

DENMARK, EMMA C.....Greenville, S. C.
Professor of History, Greenville Woman's College

DICKSON, MAJOR G. L.....Greenwood, S. C.
Headmaster, Bailey Military Institute

EASTERBY, J. H.....Charleston, S. C.
Professor of History, College of Charleston

EDWARDS, GEORGE H., JR.....Clemson College, S. C.
Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Clemson College

EPTING, CARL L.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Acting Associate Professor of History, Wofford College

FERRELL, C. M.....Columbia, S. C.
Associate Professor of History, University of S. C.

FLIPPIN, PERCY SCOTT.....Hartsville, S. C.
Professor of Hisory, Coker College

GALLOWAY, L. C.....Due West, S. C.
Professor of History and Economics, Erskine College

GEE, MRS. JAMES.....Florence, S. C.
Florence High School

GILPATRICK, D. H.....Greenville, S. C.
Associate Professor of History, Furman University

GREEN, E. L.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of Ancient Languages, University of S. C.

GREGORIE, ANNE KING.....Mt. Pleasant, S. C.

GRIFFIN, CHARLES M.....Union, S. C.
Pastor, Westside Baptist Church

GRIFFITH, HELEN.....Florence, S. C.
Florence High School

HENNIG, MRS. JULIAN.....Columbia, S. C.

HOLMES, A. G.....Clemson College, S. C.
Professor of History, Clemson College

HOWARD, LAURA E.....Hartsville, S. C.
Professor of History, Coker College

HURD, A. M.....Rock Hill, S. C.
Rock Hill High School

JONES, F. D.....Clinton, S. C.
Professor of Psychology and Philosophy, Presbyterian College

KEITH, W. G.....Rock Hill, S. C.
Professor of History, Winthrop College

KIBLER, LILLIAN.....Newberry, S. C.
Newberry High School

LEAMAN, MRS. S. L.....Greenwood, S. C.
Assistant in History, Lander College

LESESNE, J. M.....Columbia, S. C.
University of S. C.

LEVETT, ELLA P.....Charleston, S. C.
North Charleston High School

MAGILL, SADIE.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School

MARTIN, E. B.....Columbia, S. C.
University of S. C.

MERIWETHER, R. L.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of History, University of S. C.

MILLS, W. H.....Clemson College, S. C.
Professor of Rural Sociology, Clemson College

McCAIN, J. W.....Rock Hill, S. C.
Professor of English, Winthrop College

McKISSICK, J. RION.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of Journalism, University of S. C.

OLIPHANT, MRS. A. D.....Greenville, S. C.

PATTON, JAMES W.....Springfield, O.
Professor of Sociology, Wittenberg College

PEARLSTINE, HANNA.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School

PRINCE, HELEN.....Landrum, S. C.
Landrum High School

RUGHEIMER, NATALIE.....Charleston, S. C.
Memminger High School

SALLEY, A. S.....Columbia, S. C.
Secretary of the Historical Commission of S. C.

SHERRILL, G. R.....Clemson College, S. C.
Associate Professor of History and Economics, Clemson College

SINGLETON, KATHLEEN.....Columbia, S. C.
University of S. C.

SMITH, G. P.....Charleston, S. C.
Associate Professor of History, The Citadel

SNOWDEN, YATES.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of History, University of S. C.

TAYLOR, MARY.....Charleston, S. C.
Memminger High School

TAYLOR, R. H.....Greenville, S. C.
Professor of History, Furman University

WALLACE, D. D.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Professor of History, Wofford College

WATSON, H. L.....Greenwood, S. C.
Editor of The Index-Journal

WEBBER, MABEL L.....Charleston, S. C.
Secretary of the S. C. Historical Society

WHITE, FANNIE BELLE.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School

WIENEFELD, R. H.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Professor of History, Converse College

WILLIAMS, MRS. RICHARD.....Greenwood, S. C.
Professor of History, Lander College

WILLIAMS, S. J.....Charleston, S. C.
Professor of History, The Citadel

WOLFE, J. H.....Columbia, S. C.
Fellow in History, University of S. C.

CONSTITUTION

I

The name of this organization shall be The South Carolina Historical Association.

II

The objects of the Association shall be to promote historical studies in the State of South Carolina; to bring about a closer relationship among persons living in this State who are interested in history; and to encourage the preservaton of historical records.

III

Any person approved by the executive committee may become a member by paying $2.00, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of $2.00.

IV

The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary and treasurer who shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting. A list of nominations shall be presented by the executive committee, but nominations from the floor may be made. The officers shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

V

There shall be an executive committee made up of the officers and of two other members elected by ballot for a term of three years; at the first election, however, one shall be elected for two years. Vacancies shall be filled by election in the same manner at the annual meeting following their occurrence. Until such time they shall be filled by appointment by the president. The duties of the executive committee shall be to fix the date and place of the annual meeting, to attend to the publication of the proceedings of the Association, to prepare a program for the annual meetings, to prepare a list of nominations for the officers of the Association as provided in Article IV, and such other duties as may be from time to time assigned to them by the Association. There shall be such other committees as the president may appoint, or be instructed to appoint, by resolution of the Association.

VI

There shall be an annual meeting of the Association at the time and place appointed by the executive committee.

VII

The Association shall publish annually its proceedings to be known as *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*. It shall contain the constitution, by-laws, and minutes of the annual meeting together with such papers as may be selected by the executive committee. It is understood that all papers read at the annual meeting become the property of the Association except as otherwise may be provided by the executive committee.

VIII

This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at the annual business meeting.